

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trad mark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	THE NINE FIRST NAMED INVENTOR		D	ATTORNEY: DOCKETINO.
HOLLIE L BA HALE AND DC	09727790 KER IRR	HM12/0501	٦	EWOLDTEXAMINER	
WASHINGTON	DC 20004-10	008		AREUNIT	05/01/01 26

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trad marks



Office Action Summary

Application No. **08/722,659**

Applicant(s)

Bennett et al.

Examiner

G. R. Ewoldt

Art Unit **1644**



-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address -Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). Status 1) X Responsive to communication(s) filed on Jan 30, 2001 2b) This action is non-final. 2a) X This action is FINAL. 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213. Disposition of Claims 4) X Claim(s) 1-7, 18, and 19 is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above, claim(s) ______ is/are withdrawn from consideration. is/are allowed. 5) Claim(s) 6) X Claim(s) 1-7, 18, and 19 is/are rejected. is/are objected to. 7) Claim(s) ______ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement. 8) Claims Application Papers 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner. 10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner. 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved. 12) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 13) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). a) \square All b) \square Some* c) \square None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). *See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 14) Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e). Attachment(s) 15) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 18) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). 19) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 16) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) 20) Other: 17) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).

Art Unit: 1644

DETAILED ACTION

- 1. The request filed on 1/30/01 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/722,659 is acceptable and a CPA has been established.
- 2. A request for a suspension of 3 months, 1/30/01 4/30/01 is granted.
- 3. An action on the CPA follows.
- 4. Claims 1-7 and 18-19 are pending and being acted upon.
- 5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:
 - (e) The invention was described in -(1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effect under this subsection of a national application published of a national application published under section 122(b) only if the international application designation the United States was

published under Article 21(2)(a) of such treaty in the English language; or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that a patent shall not be deemed filed in the United States for the purposes of this subsection based on the filing of an international application filed under the treaty defined in section

351(a).

- (f) he did not himself invent the subject matter sought to be patented.
- 6. Claims 1-7 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) or (f) over U.S. Patent No. 5,997,863, filed July 8, 1994, for the reasons of record as set forth in Paper No. 22, mailed 8/1/00.
- 7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 8. Claims 1-7 and 18-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hoogewerf et al., (W) (J. Biol. Chem.

Art Unit: 1644

270:3268, February, 1995), Gilat et al., (X) (J. Exp. Med. 181:1929, May, 1995), Vlodavsky et al., (AA) (Invasion Metastasis 12: 112, 1991), U.S. Patent No. 5,169,722 (issued Dec. 8, 1992), U.S. Patent No. 5,362,641 (issued Nov. 8, 1994, filed March 7, 1991), and U.S. Patent No. 5,567,417 (issued October 22, 1996, priority to November 17, 1993) in view of Nash et al. (J. of Pharm. and Exp. Ther. 274:1463, 1995), Lider et al. (Y) (P.N.A.S. 92:5037, May 1995), or Gilat et al. (AA) (J. Immunol. 153:4899, 1994), for the reasons of record as set forth in Paper No.22, mailed 8/1/00.

9. Claims 1-7 and 18-19 are directed to an invention not patentably distinct from claim of commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 5,997,863. Specifically, Claims 1-9 the '863 patent are drawn to methods of enhancing normal would healing by administering heparinase 2, heparinase 3, and heparinase from Flavobacterium HP206. Wound healing includes and cannot be separated from an inflammatory response, since inflammatory cells, such as neutrophils, participate in wound healing and many of the "inflammatory cytokines", i.e. TNF- α , participate in wound healing. The specification of the '863 patent discloses that would healing is generally divided into three temporally overlapping phases: inflammation, proliferation and remodeling (see column 2, lines 56-65, in particular).

Commonly assigned U.S. Patent No. 5,997,863, discussed above, would form the basis for a rejection of the noted claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) if the commonly assigned case qualifies as prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g) and the conflicting inventions were not commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made. In order for the examiner to resolve this issue, the assignee is required under 37 CFR 1.78© and 35 U.S.C. 132 to either show that the conflicting inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made or to name the prior inventor of the conflicting subject matter. Failure to comply with this requirement will result in a holding of abandonment of the application.

A showing that the inventions were commonly owned at the time the invention in this application was made will preclude a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) based upon the commonly assigned case as a reference under 35 U.S.C. 102(f) or (g).

The non-statutory double patenting rejection, whether of the obviousness-type or non-obviousness-type, is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or

Art Unit: 1644

improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent. In re Thorington, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969); In re Vogel, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); In re Van Ornum, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); In re Longi, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); and In re Goodman, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(b) and (c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a non-statutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.78(d).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 1-7 and 18-19 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obvious-type double patenting over claims 1-10 of the '863 patent. The conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other. The claims of the '863 patent pertain to method of treating wounds by administering heparinase. Wound healing is a type of inflammatory response as described, supra.

10. No claim is allowed.

11. This is a continuation of applicant's earlier Application No. 08/722,659. All claims are drawn to the same invention claimed in the earlier application and could have been finally rejected on the grounds and art of record in the next Office action if they had been entered in the earlier application. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL even though it is a first action in this case. See MPEP § 706.07(b). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no, however, event will the

Art Unit: 1644

statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dr. Gerald Ewoldt whose telephone number is (703) 308-9805. The examiner can normally be reached Monday through Thursday and alternate Fridays from 7:30 am to 5:30 pm. A message may be left on the examiner's voice mail service. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christina Chan can be reached on (703) 308-3973. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Technology Center 1600 receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0196.

Papers related to this application may be submitted to Technology Center 1600 by facsimile transmission. Papers should be faxed to Technology Center 1600 via the PTO Fax Center located in Crystal Mall 1. The faxing of such papers must conform with the notice published in the Official Gazette, 1096 OG 30 (November 15, 1989). The CM1 Fax Center telephone number is (703) 305-3014.

G.R. Ewoldt, Ph.D.
Patent Examiner
Technology Center 1600
May 1, 2001

Patrick J. Nolan, Ph.D.

Primary Examiner

Technology Center 1600